

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his findings and conclusions.

2. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 21 solely for the purpose of expediting the patent process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such amendments, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which the Applicant considers the invention herein entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Hilton Davis / Festo Statement

The amendments herein to Claims 7, 13, 20, and 21 were not made for any reason related to patentability. Claims 7, 13, and 20 were amended to clarify the invention. Claim 21 was amended to conform with standard claim drafting practices. All of the above listed amendments were made for reasons other than patentability.

3. Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner deems that the term "indirectly", inserted by way of amendment in the response filed July 26, 2007, was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. The Applicant amends Claim 21 to remove the clause "wherein said second Web server indirectly communicates with said discovery service through said first Web server" previously inserted by way of amendment in the response filed July 26, 2007. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is deemed to be overcome.

4. Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent publication no. US 20030145223 (hereinafter "Brickell").

Claim 1

- 5 The Applicant amends Claim 1 to overcome the cited art and to clarify the invention in multiple parts, each described herein.

First, the Applicant amends the preamble to conform antecedent language with descendent language used in the fourth clause of the body of the claim.

10

Second, the Applicant clarifies the second clause of the body of the claim. Particularly, the Applicant clarifies that the discovery service passes to the principal, also referred to as a user, the identity assertion and the discovery service descriptor for use by the discovery service for future authentication.

15

Third, the Applicant amends the third clause to clarify that "a Web service client" is "said first Web service client". This amendment, made according to standard claim drafting practices, distinguishes the first and second Web service clients. Descendent language is also amended to conform with antecedent usage and extraneous wording is excised.

20

Fourth, the Applicant amends the fourth clause by: conforming descendent language with antecedent usage and by providing proper antecedent basis according to standard claim drafting practices.

25

Fifth, the Applicant amends the fifth clause to conform descendent language with antecedent usage.

Sixth, the Applicant the sixth clause to require the second Web service to request information from the first Web service.

30

Seventh, the Applicant amends the seventh clause to clarify that the discovery service concatenates the second service assertion to the first service assertion and to clarify that the first and second service assertions are passed from the discovery service to the second Web service via the first Web service.

Eighth, the Applicant adds a wherein clause to clarify that the second Web service obtains chained assertions from the first Web Service, where the first Web service obtains the chained assertions from the discovery service, where the chained assertions include the identity assertion and the discovery service descriptor sent to the discovery service by the principal.

Support for the amendments is found in the application as filed at least in the Exemplary Chaining of Services section beginning at page 11 with detail at page 13, lines 14-26. Brickell does not teach or suggest chaining of service assertions or concatenating a second service assertion to a first service assertion without direct involvement by the principal. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell is deemed to be overcome.

Claim 7

As to Claim 7, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 7 requires "means for said discovery service adding said second service assertion to said first service assertion and subsequently passing said first service assertion and said second service descriptor to said first Web service". The Examiner admits that Brickell does not teach all of:

upon said first Web service determining a need to invoke a second desired service at a second Web service, means for said first Web service requesting from said discovery service a second service descriptor associated with said second Web service and a second service assertion associated with said second Web service; and

in response to receiving said request for said second service descriptor and said second service assertion, means for said discovery service adding said second service

assertion to said first service assertion and subsequently passing said first service assertion and said second service descriptor to said first Web service;

in response to receiving said first service assertion and second service descriptor, means for said first Web service invoking said desired second service at said second Web service

The Examiner explains that in the Examiner's view it is obvious "to repeat Brickell's method of invoking a service from a delegate". The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Particularly, the cited section of Claim 7 requires "adding said second service assertion to said first service assertion". Merely repeating a step does not result in adding a second assertion to a first assertion. However, in order to expedite the patent prosecution process, the Applicant amends Claim 7 to clarify that Claim 7 requires means for the discovery service concatenating the second service assertion to the first service assertion and subsequently passes the concatenated first service assertion and second service descriptor to the first Web service. Concatenization of a first service assertion and a second service descriptor is not realized by the mere repetition the process taught and described by Brickell. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell is deemed to be overcome.

Claim 13

Respectfully, the Applicant disagrees for the reasons cited, *supra*, in the Claim 7 comments referring to "adding". However, in order to expedite the patent prosecution process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00), the Applicant amends Claim 13. Particularly the Applicant amends Claim 13 to require that (1) in response to receiving said request for the second service descriptor and assertion, that the discovery service concatenates the second service assertion to the first service assertion and (2) that the discovery service subsequently passes the first service assertion and the second service descriptor to said second Web service via said first Web service. Support for the amendment is found in the section cited in the response to Claim 7 and in the application as filed at least at page 13, lines 23-26. In stark contrast to amended Claim 13, Brickell does not teach or suggest passing an assertion and a descriptor from a discovery service through a first Web

service to a second Web service. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell is deemed to be overcome.

Claim 19

- 5 The Applicant amends Claim 19 to overcome the cited art and to further clarify the invention by requiring: the discovery service retaining on behalf of the principal a footprint of: (1) the application requesting the first service descriptor and the first service assertion and (2) the first Web server requesting the second service descriptor and the second service assertion. Brickell does not teach or suggest retaining a
- 10 footprint of requested service descriptors and assertions. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell is deemed to be overcome.

Claim 20

- 15 As to Claim 20, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 20 requires, emphasis added: "means for retaining a footprint of requested services, wherein said footprint contains both said first service assertion and said second service assertion". The Examiner cites only Brickell at paragraph [0024], which reads in part:

20 [0024] A delegation relationship between a delegator and a delegate is registered with the DCSP 250. A delegator may give certain authority to its delegate. For example, a physician may delegate an office administrator the authority of inquiring [about] drug information. ... To register a delegation relationship with the DCSP 250, both the authority and the signed message are communicated to the DCSP 250.

- Brickell further defines the DCSP in paragraph [0022] as a relying party authorizes
- 25 services to a plurality of delegates based on delegate information obtained from a delegation credential service provider (DCSP). Thus, the DCSP is a delegation credential service. The Applicant can find no suggestion by the Examiner that the credential service of Brickell teaches or describes the Claim 20 requirement of "retaining a footprint of requested services". Certainly, Brickell does not teach or suggest the
- 30 footprint containing both said first service assertion and said second service assertion. To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim, MPEP § 2131. Under MPEP 706 it is stated that "the goal of examination is to clearly articulate any

rejection early in the prosecution process so that the applicant has the opportunity to provide evidence of patentability and otherwise reply completely at the earliest opportunity." The Examiner is requested to detail his rejections so that the Applicant may understand the basis of the rejections. These requests are respectfully made so
5 that the Applicant can respond to the rejections in order to further the patent prosecution of the pending application. In view of MPEP 706, the current rejection of Claims 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell is deemed to be improper.

Claim 21

10 The Applicant amends Claim 21 to overcome the cited art and to further clarify the invention by requiring: the discovery service to maintain a footprint of requested services, where the footprint contains both the first service assertion and the second service assertion. Brickell does not teach or suggest retaining a footprint of requested service assertions. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §
15 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell is deemed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all outstanding rejections, allowing the Application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, he is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's attorney at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862